DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 890 SP 033 697

AUTHOR Wolf, Kenneth P.

TITLE Teaching Portfolios: Synthesis of Research and Annotated Bibliography.

INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 91
CONTRACT RP91002006
NOTE 36p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Annotated Bibliographies; *Content Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; *Portfolios (Background Materials); Professional Associations; *Research Projects; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Selection

ABSTRACT

This literature review and annotated bibliography addresses teaching portfolios, utilized by teachers to improve and demonstrate their knowledge and skills in teaching. The document, organized into three sections, discusses several key issues related to teaching portfolios. The first section on issues in portfolio design and implementation includes: (1) what is a teaching portfolio (or teaching dossier, as it is referred to in some of the higher education literature)? (2) what purposes can it serve? (3) what dimensions of teaching are important to document in a portfolio? (4) what kinds of evidence should go into a teaching portfolio? (5) how should evidence be selected? and (6) how should a teaching portfolio be evaluated? Section 2 identifies projects and organizations in the field that are exploring alternative forms of teacher assessment, including the use of teaching portfolios. The final section presents an annotated bibliography categorized by projects in which portfolios have been employed. This section is divided into two parts, one on portfolios for K-12 educators and the other on portfolios for higher education faculty. Each part lists authors in alphabetical order. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: SP

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. EA

ED343890

Teaching Portfolios

Synthesis of Research and Annotated Bibliography

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP 033 697

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
730 Harrison Street, San Francisco, CA 94107-1242 (415) 565-3000

Teaching Portfolios

Synthesis of Research and Annotated Bibliography

Kenneth P. Wolf

November 1991

This document is supported by federal funds from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, contract number RP91002006. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

TEACHING PORTFOLIOS:
SYNTHESIS OF RESEARCH AND ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Portfolios have recently become a very popular topic in education. Student portfolios have received most of the attention, but there is a growing interest in teaching portfolios — portfolios constructed by teachers to improve and demonstrate their knowledge and skills in teaching. Many practitioners, researchers, and organizations are exploring the use of teaching portfolios at both the K-12 level and in higher education for a variety of purposes. A number of teacher educators are asking pre-service teachers to document and examine their early teaching experiences through portfolios as a way to stimulate reflective practice; some school districts are considering the use of portfolios to evaluate beginning teachers for tenure; the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is exploring the use of teaching portfolios in its voluntary, national certification of accomplished practitioners; and the American Association of Higher Education is promoting teaching portfolios as part of its initiative on improving college and university teaching.

While teaching portfolios take on a variety of forms and serve a variety of purposes, similar questions cut across all of these different efforts: What is a teaching portfolio? What is its purpose? How should a teaching portfolio be structured? What should it contain? How should it be evaluated? Many individuals and organizations are wrestling with these and related issues. This review of the literature and annotated bibliography aims to address these questions and provide resources to those struggling with the same issues. The first section of this document discusses several key issues related to teaching portfolios. The next section identifies projects and organizations in the field who are exploring the use of teaching portfolios. The final section presents an annotated bibliography on the topic. Future versions of this document will include a listing of names and project descriptions of those putting teaching portfolios into practice.

Issues in Portfolio Design and Implementation

A teaching portfolio can take many forms, and these various forms are determined by decisions that are made about the purposes, content, process,

and structure of the portfolio. This section of the paper raises issues that are important to consider in designing, implementing, and evaluating teaching portfolios, and offer perspectives on how these questions have been addressed by others. The reader should be alerted that this paper will argue for a particular conception of a teaching portfolio; other perspectives are included, however, to provide as broad a view of the terrain as possible.

1) What is a teaching portfolio (or teaching dossier, as it is referred to in some of the higher education literature)?

On the simplest level, a teaching portfolio is a collection of information that provides evidence about a teacher's effectiveness. Stopping with this definition, however, runs the risk of turning portfolio construction into an act of amassing papers. Pushing the definition a step further helps to prevent the portfolio from turning into a scrapbook.

Alternatively, a teaching portfolio is a structured collection of evidence of a teacher's best work that is selective, reflective, and collaborative, and demonstrates a teacher's accomplishments over time and across a variety of contexts (Edgerton, Hutchings, & Quinlan, in press; Wolf, 1991). In this view, the portfolio is more than a list of a teacher's accomplishments, it contains *actual samples of teaching performances* (e.g., lesson plans, syllabi, student work) and, along with those examples and evidence of the work itself, the teacher's *reflections* on the significant of that work. Moreover, the portfolio is *structured* around key dimensions of teaching, such as planning, teaching, evaluation of students, and professional activities. The evidence selected for the portfolio is not intended to represent all of the teacher's work — the mediocre along with the meritorious — rather it should illustrate the very *best work* that the person can accomplish. Even so, the portfolio is not expected to be a comprehensive account of all of a teacher's accomplishments, but a *selective* one that highlights the distinctive features of that individual's approach to teaching. At the same time, however, the portfolio should be more than a few snapshots, but should reflect a person's accomplishments over time and in a variety of contexts. In addition, portfolio construction is not intended to be a solo flight but a *collaborative* venture, in which the portfolio reflects the contri-

butions and influences of others, such as mentors, colleagues, and students. In this view, the portfolio is more than a summary of a teacher's accomplishments, more than "a resume on steroids" (D. Tierney, personal communication, October 31, 1991), it is a vehicle for capturing some of the complexities and contextual features of teaching in an individually distinctive manner.

The following definitions of teaching portfolios have been offered by others:

> "A teaching dossier is a document that a faculty member creates to communicate teaching goals, to summarize accomplishments, and to convey the quality of teaching" (Waterman, 1991).
>
> "A teaching dossier is a summary of a professor's major teaching accomplishments and strengths" (Short et al., 1986).
>
> "What is a teaching portfolio? It is a factual description of a professor's major strengths and teaching achievements. It describes documents and materials which collectively suggest the scope and quality of a professor's teaching performance" (Seldin, in press, p. 4).
>
> "A schoolteacher's portfolio can be defined as a container for storing and displaying evidence of a teacher's knowledge and skills. However, this definition is incomplete. A portfolio is more than a container — a portfolio also represents an attitude that assessment is dynamic, and that the richest portrayals of teacher (and student) performances are based upon multiple sources of evidence collected over time in authentic settings" (Wolf, 1991).
>
> "So what is a teaching portfolio? In the broadest sense, the teaching portfolio is a container in which many different ideas can be poured. . . . At the same time, it seems to us that

> some versions of the portfolio are likely to be much more powerful in advancing good teaching — and therefore more learning — than others. Thus, this monograph describes and argues for a rather particular image of the portfolio. At the heart of the portfolio as we envision it are samples of teaching performance; not just what teachers say about their practice but artifacts and examples of they actually do. We argue, too, that portfolios should be reflective: work samples would be accompanied by faculty commentary and explanation that reveal not only what was done but why, the thinking behind the teaching. Finally, we argue for portfolios that are structured and selective, . . . a careful selection of evidence organized around agree upon categories, which themselves represent key dimensions of the scholarship of teaching" (Edgerton, Hutchings, & Quinlan, in press).

2) What purposes can a teaching portfolio serve?

A teaching portfolio serves two main purposes: improvement and evaluation. The ultimate goal for constructing teaching portfolios is to improve the quality of teaching — hence, the quality of student learning. Teaching portfolios are particularly well-suited to this task because they allow teachers (and others) to examine actual work performances over time and across contexts in ways that other forms of assessment cannot.

The evaluative function of portfolios, however, while secondary in importance to the formative function, is often the motivating force for keeping portfolios. Without some form of external support and rewards, most teachers simply will not keep portfolios. While of tremendous value, it is a time-consuming and strenuous task to document and critically examine one's own performance in a systematic and extended fashion. Without some form of encouragement, teachers will be swept away by the tsunami-like everyday demands of their job. Thus, the two purposes — improvement and evaluation — are likely to go hand-in-hand.

At the same time, as Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan (in press) point out, too much of an emphasis on evaluation may be more than this newly emerging technology can support. High-stakes assessment can exert tremendous pressure on the portfolio process, potentially distorting the assessment approach and undermining its original purposes. Portfolios could turn into a documentation nightmare. In the initial stages of implementing teaching portfolios, then, as a culture of portfolio assessment is being created and the procedures for developing and evaluating portfolios are under construction, it would be wise to proceed with caution.

In addition to the two main purposes of improvement and evaluation, other purposes that have been discussed include providing models of exemplary teaching, stimulating a conversation about teaching, and (in higher education) providing information to students in selecting courses. The comments below provide a sampling of some of the purposes that have been suggested for teaching portfolios:

> "The aim of the dossier is . . . to create a document that expresses some of the uniqueness of your teaching while displaying your areas of teaching expertise" (Waterman, 1991).

> "For what purpose might a teaching portfolio be prepared? It can be used: 1) to gather and present hard evidence and specific data about teaching effectiveness for those who judge performance; and/or 2) to provide the needed structure for self-reflection about which areas of teaching performance need improvement (Pascal and Wilburn, 1978; Shore et al., 1986; Shulman, 1989b)" (Seldon, in press, p. 4).

> "The three most important [reasons for evaluating teaching by higher education faculty] are: 1) to improve the quality of teaching based on a knowledge of strengths and weaknesses, 2) to help students make choices among courses, and 3) to

include teaching effectiveness among the criteria for career advancement decisions" (Short et al., 1986).

"The Teacher Assessment Project research explored the role that portfolios can serve in the voluntary, national certification of accomplished teachers. . . . While the primary focus in this study was on the role that portfolios can play in the evaluation of schoolteachers, it is important to keep in mind that a teacher's portfolio can (and should) serve purposes beyond evaluation, such as promoting the development of individual teachers and highlighting exemplary practices" (Wolf, 1991).

"Portfolios can foster a culture of teaching and a new discourse about it. . . . Institutions or departments might also turn to portfolios purely to cultivate a more thoughtful discussion about the elements of good teaching" (Edgerton, Hutchings, & Quinlan, in press).

3) What dimensions of teaching are important to document in a portfolio?

In discussing what might be documented in a K-12 teaching portfolio, Bird (1990) offers "five intertwined clusters of schoolteachers' activity: teaching a class, planning and preparation, student and program evaluation, interaction with other educators, and interaction with parents and member of a community" (p. 250), with teaching a class as the central domain around which the other activities are oriented. These five activities offer a reasonable organization for the portfolio. Bird goes on to say that each of these teaching activities should be considered in light of the "four intertwined concerns that must be resolved more or less simultaneously" (p. 251): responsibility, subject matter, individual students, and class organization.

Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan (in press), believe that the teaching portfolio should be organized around the key dimensions of teaching, and they

draw on the work of the Teacher Assessment Project (which drew on the work of Bird, 1990) as a starting point for the discussion. TAP proposed four core tasks of teaching around which the portfolio should be structured: course planning and preparation, actual teaching, evaluating student learning and providing feedback, and professional responsibilities (e.g., keeping up with developments in the field, contributing to local community).

The Canadian Association of University Teachers (Shore et al., 1986) identifies four parts of the professor's role: 1) teaching, 2) research and scholarship, 3) participating in community governance, and 4) service to the community.

4) What kinds of evidence should go into a teaching portfolio?

A variety of evidence can be put into a teaching portfolio — student work, a list of books read by students, unit plans, student evaluations, professional publications, videotapes of one's teaching, honors, descriptions of teaching materials and so on. The list is quite lengthy and includes print as well as non-print items, such as videotapes, computer software, and diagrams of the classroom arrangement.

The Canadian Association of University Teachers (Shore et al., 1986) provides a list of 49 different items that could be included in a teaching portfolio. The list is divided into three categories (with each category further subdivided): 1) the products of good teaching (e.g., student scores on standardized or teacher-made tests, record of students who have succeeded in advanced courses of study in the field, evidence of help given to colleagues), 2) material from oneself (e.g., list of course titles, description of how nonprint materials were used in teaching, conducting research on one's own teaching), and 3) information from others (e.g., teaching evaluation data, independent observation of teaching by colleague, comments from students' parents).

The number of potential items for inclusion in a portfolio on most lists is quite large, but criteria for selecting among these items is often not given (largely for fear of constraining the portfolio constructor). For example, the

following guideline is offered by the Canadian Association for University Professors (Shore et al., 1986) for deciding what information to include in the portfolio: "The dossier [portfolio] should be compiled to make the best possible case for teaching effectiveness" (p. 6).

The portfolio, however, might be shaped and limited, without sacrificing its ability to capture the complexities and real contexts of teaching by aligning it with a few key dimensions of teaching. A teacher then might provide an array of evidence to demonstrate his or her accomplishments in these key areas (e.g., planning, teaching, evaluation, professional duties). Tying the choice of evidence to a few key categories helps to limit the amount of information to be collected.

The portfolio could be further shaped by specifying that certain types of evidence are required in all portfolios. Standardizing the contents to some degree makes it easier for others to interpret each individual portfolio as well as make comparisons across many different portfolios. The following pieces of evidence might be required in all portfolios, for example: lesson or unit plans, samples of student work, and videotapes of one's teaching and/or observations of one's teaching by qualified others. These three types of evidence provide an overview of the course, evidence of student learning, and direct evidence of the quality of teaching.

Additional information might then vary across teachers and could include a wide variety of evidence, such as a course syllabus, awards to one's students, a videotape of a class play. This additional evidence would accompany the core mandatory evidence, and would be selected by the teacher depending upon the points that he or she wanted to illustrate.

While actual samples of teaching performances, such as student work, teacher planning documents, and lecture notes, are at the heart of the portfolio, these pieces of evidence by themselves are insufficient. Without any annotation about their development and uses, these pieces of evidence are largely uninterpretable. What is necessary, along with the actual samples of performances, are descriptions and interpretations of the evidence and the teacher's

reflections on the significance of the entire collection. On the other hand, reflections alone are not sufficient either. For without connecting these reflections to actual samples of performance, they tell us what teachers say they do, but not necessarily what they actually do.

5) How should evidence be selected for inclusion in the portfolio?

One approach to portfolio construction is to present a long list of possible items for inclusion in the portfolio and advise the maker of the portfolio to select those pieces of evidence that most convincingly demonstrate his or her competence. This approach invites chaos, makes the portfolio so idiosyncratic that it is difficult to evaluate, and risks turning portfolio construction into a paper chase. At the other extreme is the approach in which all of the pieces of the portfolio are specified by someone other than the person preparing the portfolio. This approach opens the possibility that unusual and unexpected (yet exemplary) teaching styles will be excluded, removes control of the assessment process from the hands of the teacher, and risks washing out the distinctive nature of each person's approach.

A middle ground that steers between these two extremes, one that helps to ensure that the portfolio is somewhat standardized and comprehensive, yet is inclusive of all teaching styles and situations, is put forth by Bird (personal communication, cited in Wolf, 1991). Bird advises: Be explicit and directive about the form and procedure of documentation but permissive about the content of the portfolio. This approach helps to avoid the problems of quality and quantity control that occur when the portfolio is viewed as an empty container into which everything and anything can be tossed. In this way, teachers are given control of selecting the particular evidence for the portfolio, but are given guidelines about the types and amount of evidence to include.

6) How should a teaching portfolio be evaluated?

Designing portfolios presents one set of challenges, constructing them a somewhat different, but no less difficult, set of problems to tackle. But it is

portfolio evaluation that presents the most demanding and critical set of issues to address. Setting standards for performance and identifying criteria for evaluating the contents of a portfolio force us to go beyond polite and vague discussions about the contents of the portfolio to profound and focused conversations in which we are forced to carefully articulate the features of exemplary teaching, identify the many and unexpected forms that it can take, and distinguish it from the merely adequate (or less).

When portfolios are used for evaluative purposes, as they frequently are, questions about the evaluation process, rather than issues about portfolio design and construction, often dominate the discussion. Who evaluates the portfolio? How is it evaluated? By what criteria? The attention paid to the evaluation process is justified, for answers to these questions shape the design and construction of the portfolio.

The Stanford Teacher Assessment Project explored both a fine-grained scoring system as well a more holistic process for scoring teachers' portfolios, and found that the holistic approach allowed teaching to be examined in a more coherent fashion and avoided chopping the act of teaching up into many disconnected pieces, as can happen with overly analytical scoring schemes (Wolf, 1991).

This holistic approach to portfolio evaluation depends heavily on professional judgment, which is most successful when there are a few, clear performance criteria (Haertel, 1990). If there are too many criteria for people to keep in mind, they tend to fragment the evaluation task and reduce it to a formula. On the other hand, if there are a few global criteria, people tend to respond with their gut feelings. Employing a limited number of clear criteria for evaluating the portfolio, however, helps to guide people's judgments without causing them to retreat to formulas that lose sight of the overall performance.

The Teacher Assessment Project developed a procedure for scoring an individual's portfolio that used multiple evaluators for each person's portfolio. Some scorers were trained to score particular sections of the portfolio (e.g., student evaluation), and evaluated the same sections across many different

portfolios. Other scorers examined the entire contents of a single teacher's portfolio. Thus, scoring represented an amalgam of judgments from different raters and different vantage points.

Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan (in press) acknowledge that many of the details of portfolio evaluation are yet to worked out, and evaluation practices could take different directions in different contexts. The key to these discussions, they contend, is to keep in mind that purposes should drive practices. For example, if the primary goal for keeping portfolios is to stimulate a school- or campus-wide discussion about teaching, then it is probably not important to specify the contents of the portfolio. If the primary purpose is for evaluation, then some standardization of the portfolio becomes important to help make the portfolio more interpretable and to better allow comparisons across portfolios.

The questions about portfolio design, implementation, and evaluation that were addressed in this document are intended to stimulate a conversation about the purposes and practices associated with the use of teaching portfolios. The following sections of this document are intended to provide information about resources for further exploration of these and other questions.

Major Projects and Organizations Exploring the Use of Teaching Portfolios

The following section describes various projects and organizations who are exploring alternative forms of teacher assessment, including teaching portfolios, and who may provide further information on the topic:

American Association of Higher Education (AAHE). AAHE has launched a "teaching initiative" which is focusing on the use of teaching cases and teaching portfolios as vehicles for enhancing teaching effectiveness in higher education. They have formed a consortium of colleges and universities to explore and support the development of faculty portfolios. AAHE will soon be publishing a monograph by Edgerton, Hutchings, and Quinlan tentatively titled: *The teaching portfolio: Capturing the scholarship of teaching* (see annotated bibliography). Russell Edgerton, President; Pat Hutchings, Senior Associate and Director, Projects on Teaching. For further information, contact AAHE, Suite 600, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 293-6440.

Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation (CREATE). CREATE is an federally-funded (OERI) project housed at The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University. CREATE aims to "identify and examine critical issues in evaluation of teachers, other educators, and schools." The teacher evaluation component of CREATE is The Teacher Evaluation Models Project (TEMP) in Point Reyes, CA (see description of TEMP below). Director, Daniel L. Stufflebeam. For further information, contact The Evaluation Center, Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation, A401 Ellsworth Hall, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5178, (616) 387-5895, Fax 387-5923.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. The Consortium, a project of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), was begun by the Connecticut and California departments of education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to develop a network for sharing information on teacher assessment. The Consortium,

presently composed of members from more than a dozen states, has established a clearinghouse and conducts periodic seminars on beginning teacher assessment. For further information, contact CCSSO, 139 Hall of the States, 400 North Capitol Street NW, Washington, DC 20001.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). The NBPTS is in the process of creating a voluntary, national certification program for accomplished K-12 teachers. The Board is developing state-of-the-art assessment materials and methods to be in place by 1993. In its most recent document (RFP #6), the Board identifies two main pieces in its assessment system: on-site documentation and assessment center exercises. The on-site documentation methods include classroom observations and teaching portfolios. For further information, contact NBPTS, 333 West Fort St., Suite 2070, Detroit, MI 48226, (313) 961-0830.

Teacher Assessment Project (TAP). TAP at Stanford University recently completed a four-year research and development project to explore new forms of teacher assessment. TAP, funded by the Carnegie Corporation, was undertaken with the intent of informing the newly formed National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in its development of a voluntary, national certification program for accomplished elementary and secondary classroom teachers. The project focused its attention on two forms of assessment: assessment center exercises and teaching portfolios. Teaching portfolios were developed over one school year by teachers in elementary literacy and secondary biology, and then evaluated by a team of researchers and practitioners. TAP produced many articles and technical reports which can be obtained through the project. Principle investigator, Lee Shulman. For further information, contact the Teacher Assessment Project, CERAS 507, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, 94107 (also see August theme issue on TAP in *Teacher Education Quarterly).*

Teacher Evaluation Models Project (TEMP). TEMP is a federally-funded (OERI) project that focuses on improving teacher evaluation processes. TEMP is a part of The Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation (CREATE) at Western Michigan University . TEMP

produces regular "memos" on topics in teacher evaluation, including an upcoming memo on teaching portfolios. The first set of memos identifies "Uses of Teacher Evaluation Models," "Teacher Evaluation Models," Generic Strengths and Weaknesses of T-EV Models," "Specific Strengths and Weaknesses of T-EV Models," and "Duties of the Teacher." Director, Michael Scriven. For further information, contact TEMP, PO Box 69, Point Reyes, CA 94956, (415) 663-1511, Fax 663-1913.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON TEACHING PORTFOLIOS FOR K-12 CLASSROOM TEACHERS AND HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY

The literature on teaching portfolios at this point can best be categorized by referring to the various projects in which portfolios have been employed. Major projects that have explored teaching portfolios for K-12 teachers and published their findings include:

a) The Teacher Assessment Project at Stanford University, authors of related articles include Shulman, Bird, Collins, and Wolf.

b) The Tennessee Career Ladder Program, authors of related articles include McLarty and Furtwengler;

c) The Florida Beginning Teacher Program, authors include Terry and Eade.

In higher education, the following groups or individuals have addressed the topic of teaching portfolios:

a) The American Association of Higher Education, authors include Edgerton and Hutchings;

b) The Canadian Association of University Professors, authors include Shore;

c) Peter Seldon, a professor of management at Pace University, has authored several documents on teaching portfolios in higher education.

The following annotated bibliography is divided into two sections, one on portfolios for K-12 educators and the other on portfolios for higher education faculty. Each section lists authors in alphabetical order.

Annotated Bibliography: K-12 Teaching Portfolios

Berry, D., Kisch, J., Ryan, C., & Uphoff, J. (1991). *The process and product of portfolio construction.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL., April, 1991.

At the invitation of Lee Shulman, a consortium of universities and school districts was formed (Wright State University, the University of Dayton, Central State University, and the Dayton City School System) to develop a process for increasing reflectivity skills of first year teachers. In examining the effects that keeping a portfolio has on entry year teachers, the evidence suggests that portfolios help teachers to develop classroom management skills, content pedagogy, command of subject matter, student-specific pedagogy and professional responsibility.

Biddle, J. & Lasley, T. (1991). *Portfolios and the Process of Teacher Education*. Paper presented at the American Association of Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL., April, 1991.

This paper describes the various forms that portfolios took at three different universities in the Ohio Consortium, a collaboration among three different universities and a school district in Ohio, that was organized at the invitation of Lee Shulman of the Teacher Assessment Project at Stanford University. "The Wright State portfolio process is relatively formative in nature; the theme of their program is 'Teacher as Problem Solver and Developing Professional'" (p. 11). The student portfolios are intended to be used in employment interviews and as a vehicle for self-assessment. "The Central State portfolios are more informal in structure. Central State emphasizes portfolio parties where students share experiences and identify personal and professional goals" (p. 12). "The University of Dayton portfolios are more constructionist . . . and include a wide array of materials that students determine make sense for them and [that reflect] their own emerging understanding of the personal and professional dimensions of teaching" (p. 13).

Bird, Tom. (1990). The schoolteacher's portfolio: An essay on possibilities. In Jason Millman and Linda Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation: Assessing Elementary and Secondary School Teachers*, 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 241-256.

Bird presents various images for a portfolio — an artist's portfolio, a pilot's log, a salesperson's catalog, a scout's sash with merit badges — each of which presents its owner's work in dramatically different ways. He discusses how the schoolteacher's portfolio might take a different form from any one of these other versions of portfolios and how the concept of portfolios might be fitted to the profession of school teaching.

The article discusses the purpose, organization, and meaning of the portfolio for schoolteachers. Purposes considered include "selection decisions, teacher development, school reform, and professionalization of schoolteaching" (p. 245).

The organization of the portfolio is boiled down to two questions: Who will participate in constructing portfolios? What will guide them in their work on portfolios? Bird offers three variations on each question and portrays them in a three-by-three matrix with examples for each of the nine cells of the matrix. In considering who participates in constructing the portfolios, Bird refers to entries produced 1) mainly by the teacher, 2) jointly by the teacher and others, and 3) mainly by others. In considering what will guide the selection of evidence for the portfolio, the author discusses 1) informal norms, 2) mixed sources, and 3) formal prescriptions. Entries produced by the teacher include elective entries, guided entries and required entries. Entries produced jointly consist of collegial products, negotiated entries, and proctored entries. Entries produced by others include commentary, attestations, and official records.

In discussing the meaning of the portfolio, Bird discusses some activities that might show in a portfolio: teaching a class, planning, student evaluation, professional exchange, and community exchange. Each of these activities should be considered in light of the "four intertwined concerns that must be

resolved more or less simultaneously" (251): responsibility, subject matter, individual students, and class organization.

The author concludes that "the potential of portfolio procedures depends as much on the political, organizational, and professional settings in which they are used as on anything about the procedures themselves" (p. 242).

Cole, D., Messner, P. Swonigan, H., & Tillman, B. (1991). *Portfolio structure and student profiles: An analysis of education student portfolio reflectivity scores.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL., April, 1991.

This study examined the efforts of a consortium of universities (Wright State University, the University of Dayton, and Central State University, and Dayton City School System) to assess pre-service teachers' reflectivity as demonstrated through the development of professional portfolios. The consortium was organized in response to an invitation by Lee Shulman of the Teacher Assessment Project at Stanford University to examine the validity of alternative modes of teacher assessment and their impact on teacher education and teacher induction programs, especially those with significant minority enrollments. The students were instructed to provide evidence of their reflectivity by submitting materials from their courses and student teaching, along with a reflective commentary or observation notes by a peer, professor, or cooperating teacher. A subsample of the portfolios that the students prepared were scored for reflectivity on a five point scale by a team of raters.

Collins, Angelo. (1990). *Transforming the Assessment of Teachers: Notes on a Theory of Assessment for the 21st Century*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Catholic Education Association (Toronto, Ontario, Canada, April, 1990). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 321 362).

The Teacher Assessment Program (TAP) presents alternative modes of teacher evaluation to inform the deliberations of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Three experimental methods of as-

sessment — simulation exercise, portfolios, and simulation-based portfolios — were implemented by various groups of teachers. Practical application and observation helped to identify problems and effectiveness. Findings indicate that the methods are useful for teacher assessment and for establishing teachers as a community of professionals. (Summary from ERIC)

Collins, Angelo. (1990). *Novices, Experts, Veterans, and Masters: The Role of Content and Pedagogical Knowledge in Evaluating Teaching.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 319 815).

Since 1986, the Teacher Assessment Project (TAP) at Stanford University (California) has been exploring performance-based modes of assessment that capture the complexity of the practice of teaching. After a brief description of the rating procedures, the raters, and the situated-performances designed by the TAP for assessment, this paper describes the considerations that different classes of raters (novices, experts, veterans, and masters) use in rating teacher performance. BioTAP, the biology component of the TAP, has developed two forms of performance assessments for high school biology teachers: 1) portfolios, and 2) simulation exercises. During the 1988-89 school year, 16 high school biology teachers completed portfolios and simulation exercises; subjects were selected to represent a range of teaching experience. Sixteen teachers served as judges and rated the performance assessment activities. Among the other raters were a research biologist with little pedagogical knowledge and novices with no experience with TAP and/or teaching. Results indicate that raters interpreted teaching tasks in terms of their own backgrounds, with each class of raters bringing a specialized knowledge to the task. It seems that the most valid rating system would involve a multidisciplinary team of raters. (Summary from ERIC)

Collins, Angelo. (1990). *A Teacher's Portfolio — What Is Necessary and Sufficient? (A High School Biology Unit Plan as an Example.)* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational

Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990.). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 319 814).

Unit plans presented by 18 high school biology teachers as part of portfolios designed to represent their work were compared. Portfolios are increasingly being considered in the assessment of master teachers, beginning teachers, and preservice teacher candidates. The research staff of the Stanford University Teacher Assessment Project designed a portfolio development process and guided/assisted the participants as they developed their portfolios. The 18 teachers were chosen to represent diversity in experience and work conditions among biology teachers. The unit plan, one element of the total portfolio, was rated by 16 raters from the research team and the teaching profession. Teachers who developed acceptable plans had a minimum of three types of evidence: 1) the instructional sequence; 2) justification for inclusion of the topic in the syllabus; and 3) a reasoned or descriptive reflection about the successes and failures of the unit. The difference between acceptable and unacceptable plans was in the ability to reflect on the plan and its execution. The review made it clear that teachers can organize evidence of their skills, knowledge, and dispositions around a unit plan, and that raters can make judgments based on these plans. Five tables present information about the subjects. An appendix contains the biology teacher's portfolio construction kit. (Summary by ERIC)

Collins, Angelo. (1991). Portfolios for biology teacher assessment. *Journal of School Personnel Evaluation in Education, (5)*, 147-167.

Furtwengler, Carol, and Others. (1986). *Multiple Data Sources in Teacher Evaluation*. Paper presented at the National Council on Measurement in Education (San Francisco, CA, April 17-19, 1986). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 677).

The Tennessee Career Ladder Program is a statewide evaluation system designed to pay teachers for teaching well. The system is based on a set of objectives called Domains of Competence, which are subdivided into Indicators. Early in the design of the system, it was decided to use multiple data

sources, including a variety of instruments, to assess the Domains and Indicators. This paper reports the 1984-85 evaluation of 3,000 experienced classroom teachers. Grade levels K-12 and general education subject areas were included. Each teacher was evaluated by a team of three trained peer teachers from other school systems. The 105 full-time evaluators received more than 60 hours of training in administering the seven instruments: classroom observation, portfolio analysis, principal questionnaire, student questionnaires, peer questionnaires, a test, and evaluator judgment. Analysis includes descriptions of the evaluation system and of changes made in the system for use in 1985-86 and the reasons for them. The Domains and Indicators used in the 1984-85 evaluation and their data sources are included in the appendix. (Summary from ERIC)

Galton, Linda L. (1989). Thinking Skills, Grades 7-12: Small and Rural Schools. *Outstanding Teaching Practices Series*, Volume 2. Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast & Islands, Andover, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 317 365).

This publication profiles nine secondary school teachers selected as the 1988-89 Laboratory Fellows by the Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands. The Teacher Recognition Program is conducted by the Small Schools Network of the Laboratory to recognize outstanding teachers of a particular content area or skill. In 1989, nominations were sought for outstanding teachers of thinking and reasoning skills in small and rural secondary schools. The profiles of these nine teachers are excerpts from the portfolios submitted to the selection committee. Educational training, experiences, teaching philosophies, teaching techniques, and the use of thinking and reasoning skills in these teachers' coursework are presented. (Summary from ERIC)

Haertel, Edward H. (1991). New forms of teacher assessment. *Review of Research in Education, 17*, 3-29.

While this article does not focus specifically on teaching portfolios, it presents an overview of the key issues, research literature, and present efforts in teacher evaluation. The article first describes two models of teaching—the bureaucratic versus professional—and discusses the ramifications of these two models for teacher evaluation. The next section discusses various views of the knowledge base of teaching and argues that new teacher assessments must be guided not by an empirical distillation of common teaching practices, but by a theory about the underlying knowledge and skills teaching requires, which should be informed by studies of exemplary teaching. The following section describes new methods of teacher assessment, including teaching portfolios, that are under development at universities, state education departments, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The paper ends by considering psychometric and technical issues such as reliability, validity, bias, and standard setting.

McLarty, Joyce; and others. (1985). *Multiple Data Sources in Teacher Evaluation.* Paper presented at The National Council of Measurement in Education (San Francisco, CA, April 17-19, 1986). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 677).

The Tennessee Career Ladder Evaluation system, which uses a multiple data source approach to assessment, was developed to identify excellent teachers. It is used to determine whether or not the teacher should receive increasing career benefits. Evaluation data are generated by three evaluators, the teacher candidate, the school principal, three peer teachers, and twenty or more students. Extensive review was used in generating six categories of teacher competency: planning; instructional strategies; evaluation, classroom management; leadership; and effective communication. Items were field tested in different types of data collection: classroom observation; interviews with teachers and principals; questionnaires for students and peer teachers; portfolio rating; a written test; and evaluator judgement. Results from each instrument were analyzed separately and then reanalyzed as part of the set.

Intercorrelations were low, confirming that each source measured different viewpoints or aspects of performance. The resulting scores were reduced to a smaller number of scores, and then weighted. It was concluded that the multiple data source system was difficult and expensive to build, relatively inflexible, and complicated to explain. However, it provided a thorough and equitable evaluation, was relatively stable, and was logical. (Summary from ERIC)

McLarty, Joyce R. (1987). *Career Ladder Instrumentation: The Tennessee Experience.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 177).

The evaluation instruments used in the Tennessee Career Ladder program are described, and their evolution over the first three years of program implementation is traced. The instruments are designed to measure teacher performance and to determine outstanding teachers. They include: the Career Ladder Test of Professional Skills (a multiple-choice test), a classroom observation form, a candidate interview, a candidate portfolio and professional development and leadership summary, dialogues, principal interviews and questionnaires, student and peer questionnaires, and an evaluation consensus judgment. (Summary from ERIC)

Shulman, Lee S. (1987). Assessment for teaching: An initiative for the profession. *Phi Delta Kappan, (69),* 38-44.

This article describes the early history of the Teacher Assessment Project (TAP) at Stanford, a project funded by the Carnegie Corporation to explore and develop new forms of assessing teachers. The TAP research began with three research questions: What do teachers need to know and know how to do? How can that knowledge and skills be assessed? And how can a program of assessment be designed that will be adequate to the complexities of teaching, while remaining equitable for all candidates who might apply? The TAP project focused on two forms of assessment: assessment center exercises and portfolios. This article describes the development of the assessment center exercises in elementary mathematics and secondary social studies.

Shulman, Lee S. (1988). A Union of Insufficiencies: Strategies for teacher assessment in a time of educational reform. *Educational Leadership, (46)*, 36-41.

In this article, Shulman describes the work of the Teacher Assessment Project at Stanford University. He presents a combination of methods for assessing teachers: portfolios, assessment center exercises, written tests, and classroom observations. Each of these methods in itself, he argues, is insufficient for evaluating teachers. It is only through a melding of these methods that we can begin to capture a more complete and accurate picture of what teachers know and can do.

Terry, Gwenith L. & Eade, Gordon E. (1983). *The Portfolio Process: New Roles for Meeting Challenges in Professional Development*. A paper presented at the annual conference of the Association of Teacher Educators, Pensacola, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 229 342).

The Portfolio Process, piloted by the University of West Florida and recently mandated by the Florida State Board of Education as the central element of the Florida Beginning Teacher Program, is a model for professional development of teaching competence. The portfolio is both a product and a process. As a product, the portfolio is a personalized compilation of information from multiple sources. Each piece of data included is placed in the notebook as a means of representing the individual's teaching competency and/or work toward increasing competency. The portfolio as a process includes three stages within a given cycle: 1) collection of data to support teaching competence; 2) review and analysis of data by a support team; and 3) commitment to a plan of action by the teacher. During the data collection stage of the process, each participant analyzes his own strengths and needs in each competency area, makes decisions concerning where and how the work begins, and collects data from various sources. During the second stage, the teacher presents evidence of competence to a support team who, in conferences with the teacher, reviews and analyzes the data. The final stage involves the teacher and support team

agreeing on a plan of action for the teacher. This three-stage process is repeated until the desired level of competence is reached. (Summary from ERIC)

Wolf, Kenneth P. (1991). The schoolteacher's portfolio: Issues in Design, Implementation, and Evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan, (73)*, 129-136.

This paper describes the research on K-12 teaching portfolios conducted by the Teacher Assessment Project at Stanford University. The focus in this paper is on the use of teaching portfolios for the evaluation of teachers and it addresses issues concerning the conceptualization of a teaching portfolio, including its form, content, structure, presentation, and evaluation. The following questions are addressed: What is a teaching portfolio? What purposes does it serve? What is important to document? What form should a portfolio take? What kinds of evidence should go into it? How should the evidence be displayed? How should the portfolio be structured? How much evidence is necessary? Should a portfolio represent a teacher's best work? Should a portfolio be a solo performance? How should a portfolio be evaluated? What does a portfolio contribute that can't be achieved through other forms of assessment?

Additional Sources of Information: T*eacher Education Quarterly* (August, 1991) theme issue based on the work done on teaching portfolios and assessment center exercises by the Teacher Assessment Project at Stanford University.

Annotated Bibliography: Higher Education Teaching Portfolios

Boyer, E. (1990.) *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey.

In this book, Boyer discusses the growing concern that research is emphasized at the expense of teaching in many colleges and universities. In response, he proposes that scholarship be viewed as having four dimensions: 1) basic research, 2) applied research, 3) cross-disciplinary, and 4) teaching. In discussing teaching as one of the four dimensions of scholarship, Boyer calls for the assessment of teaching as a necessary step in identifying and rewarding effective teaching. Teaching portfolios are one of suggestions that he makes for accomplishing this goal.

Edgerton, R. (1991). *The teaching portfolio as a display of best work.* Paper presented at the American Association of Higher Education National Conference on Higher Education, March, 26, 1991, Washington, DC.

This paper describes the "teaching initiative" currently being carried out by AAHE, and the role that teaching portfolios play in this initiative. Edgerton, the president of AAHE, describes teaching as a "situated act," and contends that "Portfolios enable faculty to document and display their teaching in a way that stays connected to the particular situations in which their teaching occurs" (p. 3). The paper presents two different visions of teaching portfolios: the portfolio as teaching resume and the portfolio as display of best work. Edgerton argues that conceptualizing the portfolio as a teaching resume misses the point. Instead, we should see the portfolio as an models of exemplary teaching and as vehicles for stimulating conversations on campuses about teaching.

Edgerton, Russell, Hutchings, Patricia, & Quinlan, Kathleen. (in press). *The teaching portfolio: Capturing the scholarship of teaching.* A publication of The American Association of Higher Education.

This monograph argues that teaching is a scholarly act, and that it "relies on a base of expertise, a 'scholarly knowing' that needs to and *can* be identified, made public, and evaluated." The authors propose that the best way to accomplish this evaluation is through teaching portfolios.

The title of this monograph refers to the report *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), in which Ernest Boyer makes the case for four areas of scholarship by higher education faculty: 1) discovery (as in specialized research), 2) integration (as in writing a textbook), 3) application (as in consulting), and 4) teaching. The authors also draw on the work of Lee Shulman and his colleagues at the Teacher Assessment Project (TAP) at Stanford in their conceptualization of the teaching portfolio.

The monograph is divided into the following sections: 1) Teaching as a scholarly act, 2) The promise of portfolios, 3) The format and content of a portfolio, and 4) Portfolios on your campus: How to get started, and 5) Portfolios, peer review, and the culture of professionalism. The document also includes sample entries of portfolios and descriptions of activities underway at a number of campuses.

In their discussion on "the promise of portfolios," the authors describe two different conceptualizations of the teaching portfolio: 1) the portfolio as a kind of extended teaching resume versus 2) the portfolio as a display of best work. The authors come down on the side of "the portfolio as a display of best work," and contend that the portfolio ought to include samples of teaching performances (i.e., work samples), and that these work samples should be accompanied by the teacher's reflections on their significance. In addition, the portfolios should be selective and structured around key dimensions of the scholarship of teaching.

In making the case for portfolios, the authors offer the following reasons: 1) Portfolios capture the complexities of teaching, 2) Portfolios place the responsibility for evaluating teaching in the hands of the faculty, 3) Portfolios can prompt more reflective practice and improvement, and 4) Portfolios can foster a culture of teaching and a new discourse about it.

In discussing the form and content of the teaching portfolio, the authors draw on the work of the Teacher Assessment Project and contend that the portfolio should contain both actual work samples (e.g., lesson plans, student papers, lecture notes) and the teacher's reflections on the significance of that work, and that the portfolio should be organized around the critical tasks of teaching. For the TAP group these were: 1) planning, 2) teaching, 3) evaluation, and 4) professional responsibilities. In addition, the authors recommend that the portfolio contain background information about the person whose name is on the portfolio along with information about the teaching context.

While the issue of evaluation is critical to the success of teaching portfolio, many questions remain. Who should evaluate the portfolio? By what criteria? According to what kind of scoring process? The authors recommend that these questions need to be carefully addressed at each institution, but they offer some guidance in this area: Keep the portfolio lean, use holistic scoring methods, and let the purposes for keeping the portfolio drive the system for evaluating them.

The authors conclude by returning to the notion of teaching as a legitimate form of scholarship, and that teaching portfolios can help to create a culture of professionalism in teaching.

Fayne, Harriet R. (1991). *Practicing What We Preach: Key Issues in Faculty Evaluation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Atlanta, GA, March 1, 1991). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 330 266).

This paper addresses faculty evaluation and the use of performance-based assessment documents (teaching dossiers or portfolios) to promote and maintain a high level of teaching quality at the higher education level. It is suggested that an evaluation tool, such as the dossier, should emphasize teaching effectiveness and allow educational institutions to make teaching a central criterion in hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions, as well as encourage faculty to focus specifically on self-selected instructional variables as they prepare their materials. Additionally, portfolios are viewed as a way to professionalize teaching. A small, liberal arts college (Otterbein College in Ohio) is presented as a case study in the use of portfolio evaluations. The annual portfolios include: 1) goals and objectives, related to the four major areas to be evaluated (teaching, scholarship, service to students, and service to department/college/community); 2) a description of the types of support needed to achieve these goals; 3) a collection of materials related to accomplishments; and 4) a narrative summary of previous goals and objectives met or unmet. Peer observations and student course evaluations are also included in the portfolios. Illustrative portfolio examples are provided in appendices. The paper concludes with observations from faculty on the success and desirability of using portfolios in teaching assessments. (Summary from ERIC)

Hart, Kathleen A. (1989). *Faculty Performance Appraisal: A Recommendation for Growth and Change. Accent on Improving College Teaching and Learning*. National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, Ann Arbor, MI.

A well-conceived system of performance appraisal can indicate the conditions and circumstances motivating individual faculty members to improve their teaching. The performance appraisal system must be sensitive to the different ways in which faculty members fulfill their professional goals of

teaching, research, and service. The system needs to take into account the distinctive instructional approaches of various academic disciplines. An individualized portfolio system can identify the quality and quantity of teaching and research that each discipline considers appropriate and valuable, and can eliminate the inequities of standardized rating scales. Such a system can promote the goal of continuous faculty growth and development, can help individuals and departments set both long-range and short-range goals for research as well as teaching and student learning, and can avoid the problems occurring when students evaluate teaching performance. A suggested faculty portfolio plan contains: 1) a collection of materials demonstrating what the faculty member has been doing and has accomplished; 2) a plan outlining the faculty member's goals and objectives; 3) a description of support needed to reach goals; and 4) a description of the evidence that will demonstrate that those goals have been reached. (Summary from ERIC)

Seldin, P. (1991). *The Teaching Portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion / tenure decisions*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publications.

The author offers the following definition of a teaching portfolio (taken from a draft document). "It is a factual description of a professor's major strengths and teaching achievements. It describes documents and materials which collectively suggest the scope and quality of a professor's teaching performance" (p. 4). As for its purposes: "It can be used: 1) to gather and present hard evidence and specific data about teaching effectiveness or those who judge performance; and/or 2) to provide the needed structure for self-reflection about which areas of teaching performance need improvement (Pascal and Wilburn, 1978; Shore et al., 1986; Shulman, 1989b)" (p. 4).

The author recommends that the portfolio be selective and prepared in consultation with others, and that those who prepare and review portfolios be appropriately trained. Five steps are proposed for preparing the portfolio: 1) Summarize teaching responsibilities 2) Select criteria for effective teaching 3) Arrange the criteria in order 4) Assemble support data 5) Incorporate the portfolio in the curriculum.

The article suggests possible items for inclusion in the portfolio and discusses how the portfolio can be used to make personnel decisions and improve performance.

Seldin, P. & Annis, L. (1990). The teaching portfolio. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development, (8)*, 197-201.

Shore, B.M., Foster, S.F., Knapper, C.K., Nadeau, G.G., Neill, N., & Sim, V.W. (1986). *The Teaching Dossier: A guide to its preparation and use,* (revised edition). Montreal: Canadian Association of University Teachers.

This document is a guide for preparing and using teaching portfolios. The document contains six parts: 1) general explanation, 2) advice to administrators, 3) guide to creating and selecting materials for portfolio, 4) list of possible items for inclusion in the portfolio, 5) samples of teaching portfolios, and 6) a selected bibliography. A teaching portfolio is conceptualized as a three-page summary of teaching accomplishments supportable by more complete evidence and defined as "a summary of a professor's major teaching accomplishments and strengths." Three important reasons are given for evaluating teaching: "(1) to improve the quality of teaching based on a knowledge of strengths and weaknesses, 2) to help students make choices among courses, and 3) to include teaching effectiveness among the criteria for career advancement decisions" (Short et al., 1986).

Waterman, Margaret A. (1991). *Teaching portfolios for summative and peer evaluation.* Paper presented at the Sixth American Association for Higher Education Conference on Assessment for Higher Education, San Francisco, CA, 1991.

This paper describes the use of teaching portfolios (called "teaching dossiers") at the University of Pittsburgh by faculty members who are nominated for the President's Distinguished Teaching Award. "A teaching dossier is a document that a faculty member creates to communicate teaching goals, to summarize accomplishments, and to convey the quality of teaching." "The aim

of the dossier is . . . to create a document that expresses some of the uniqueness of your teaching while displaying your areas of teaching expertise." The teaching portfolio is broken into five main categories: 1) Teaching Responsibilities, 2) Reflective Statement on Teaching Goals, 3) Representative Instructional Materials from Two Settings, 4) Recent Teaching Evaluations, and 5) Description of Activities Undertaken to Improve Teaching. The paper provides guidelines and examples for constructing and evaluating a teaching portfolio.